

**AMERICAN INCONSISTENCIES IN
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THE
OBJECTS TO BE ATTAINED
BY THIS WAR**



AN ADDRESS

BY

HOMER ALBERS

Dean of Boston University Law School

Before the Men's Club, All Souls Church, Braintree, Mass.

November 14, 1917

AMERICAN INCONSISTENCIES IN
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THE
OBJECTS TO BE ATTAINED
BY THIS WAR



AN ADDRESS

BY

HOMER ALBERS

Dean of Boston University Law School

Before the Men's Club, All Souls Church, Braintree, Mass.

November 14, 1917

D 570
.15
A 455

By Transfer
SEP 24 1923





THE United States of America is the country in which we live, and which we love. It is the country which, during the period of its existence, has contributed more than has any other to the advantage of mankind; more in material things, and more in the teachings of self-government accompanied by national self-control. It is the country of freedom of thought and of speech; of decent living and voluntary united action.

We are nationally optimistic, sometimes bombastic; generous, sometimes extravagant; enthusiastic, sometimes impulsive; sympathetic, sometimes to the extent of being meddlesome in the affairs of others.

We are now in a great war. It is a difficult task which we have undertaken. If Germany wins, the world will be her subject. The very statement of the danger shows the need of preventing such calamity. We simply must prevent Germany from winning. But even while we fight to win, we should begin to think of what we are going to accomplish by winning; what is going to make the war most nearly worth while; not only to preserve our liberty and our rights, but to snatch some real good out of this horrible evil.

To do this we should first pay regard to history. To get ourselves in the proper frame of mind we should consider some of our own mistakes and inconsistencies: not for the purpose of mere fault-finding, but so that we may profit by our mistakes. Loyalty does not mean blindness. Loyalty which is worth while means not only to save our country from present disaster, but to guide her to greater prosperity and to justice. Unless during this period of war, prior to the peace negotiations, we educate ourselves for the desired results of victory, that victory may be empty; may not achieve all that it should; may leave us open to like or even greater dangers from other sources.

Let us consider together whether the inconsistencies of the past should not warn us against a too ready acceptance of plausible views which sound altruistic but which are essentially illogical; or of doctrines which are presently pleasing, but ultimately destructive of other doctrines more essential to our welfare.

In 1812, Great Britain, being then at war with France, stopped American vessels on the high seas, searched the vessels for British subjects, or those whom England claimed to be British subjects, took them by force from the American vessels and impressed them into the British service. And this, although these alleged British subjects were

rendering no unneutral service, and when they were upon a neutral vessel sailing from one neutral port to another neutral port. (45 MASS. HIST. SOCIETY REP. 508.)

America claimed that Great Britain had no right to stop a neutral vessel and to take therefrom even British subjects, much less American citizens, and hence declared war against Great Britain, and what we call the War of 1812 was the result.

The Treaty of Peace ending the war of 1812 did not mention the cause of the war, but left the matter an absolutely open question.

During our civil war, two non-combatants representing the South sailed from Havana on the British Mail Steamship TRENT bound for Southampton, England. On November 8, 1861, the next day after the ship left Havana, she was overhauled in the Bahama Channel by an American Man-of-War under the command of Captain Wilkes. After the American ship had fired shot and shell the TRENT hove to, was boarded by sailors and marines from the American ship, and Mason and Slidell were by force taken from the ship and imprisoned in Fort Warren, Boston Harbor. When the knowledge of this fact came to our country, the people went wild with delight. The Secretary of the Navy (Welles) sent a congratulatory letter to Captain Wilkes: Boston gave him a banquet at which Governor Andrews and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court spoke with enthusiasm, and the National House of Representatives gave a vote of thanks to Captain Wilkes. The press of the country was almost unanimous in expressing its satisfaction and joy over this capture. The Boston Transcript, the Advertiser, Herald, New York Tribune, the New York Herald, the Times and Evening Post,—practically all of the important papers, lauded Captain Wilkes and praised his conduct. I am not criticising these papers. I am merely stating the facts. The newspapers voiced the general opinion.

Now please note exactly what we did, as compared with what we claimed in 1812. We stopped a neutral vessel sailing from one neutral port to another neutral port, searched her, and seized by force non-combatants (but citizens of our belligerent opponent) engaged upon no unneutral business. Yet the people of the country at that time would have voted, ten to one, to go to war with Great Britain when Great Britain protested against the act.

Great Britain did protest, and contended that a vessel in good faith running from one neutral port to another neutral port *could not* legally be interfered with. For example, the Duke of Argyle in writing to

Senator Sumner on January 10, 1862, stated that under such circumstances Great Britain contended that such a vessel *could not* contain contraband of war, if the vessel sailed from a neutral port to a neutral port. France made the same contention (see letter of Thouvenal to Mercier, December 3, 1861, 47 MASS. HIST. SOCIETY).

Neither Great Britain nor France contended that a belligerent had no right to *stop* a neutral vessel; they admitted that right; but contended that the right to stop was solely for the purpose of ascertaining whether the vessel was in good faith neutral, and in good faith sailing from one neutral port to another neutral port. Thus the Duke of Argyle further wrote to Senator Sumner: "If a vessel is really neutral, and her destination is really neutral and not assumed, she is free from any possible charge of contraband. The capture of such a vessel in any form would be resisted as a matter of essential principle by us (i.e., England) and by all neutral powers."

It is not my purpose to point out the international inconsistencies of some other nation. Were it so, a comment might be made with reference to England's present views: to her action before our entry into the war, in stopping our ships and Dutch and Norwegian ships sailing from our ports to Holland and to Norway, and seizing non-contraband cargo destined to Holland, to Denmark, and to Norway and Sweden.

Note, therefore, that our people were in 1861 almost unanimously prepared to fight to overturn the doctrine which they fought to establish in 1812. Fortunately the Initiative and Referendum, the immediate decision of matters of state by popular vote, was not then in vogue. We had a cool-headed minister to England—Charles Francis Adams; we had a logical Secretary of State—Seward; we had a serene and level-headed president, Lincoln; and so, notwithstanding the thanks to Captain Wilkes of the Secretary of the Navy and of Congress; and notwithstanding the plaudits and the universal acclaim of the American people because of their seizure, Mason and Slidell were returned to England; but not until after the British Government had demanded their liberation and a suitable apology for our aggression. Meanwhile, and before the liberation, many of the British people had been just as anxious for war as our own. Some 8000 soldiers were gathered together in Canada and a large fleet was prepared to sail against us.

Our people were in 1861 maintaining an attitude inconsistent with the principles for which we fought in 1812, and only the coolness of a few persons saved us from an inconsistent war.

Let us consider another inconsistency from which we were not saved, although there was no war with reference to it. By our law an alien is a person born of foreign parents in a foreign country, and who has not been naturalized. The very definition of an alien shows our inconsistency; the necessary conflict if other nations make the like claim.

In accordance with this definition, the United States Supreme Court has decided that a child born in this country, of Chinese parents, is a citizen of this country. There are certain exceptions to this rule, which, however, are not important for our purpose. For example, children of ambassadors are not claimed by us. This is on the theory that ambassadors and ministers of foreign countries carry with them under their feet their country's land. Whether we would claim as a citizen, a child born here of parents who were merely passing through the country, has not been finally decided. But you will readily see from the definition of an alien, that if an English couple residing in Boston have a child here which we claim, and an American couple residing in London have a child there which we also claim, if England made the same legal claims, the child would necessarily be a citizen of both countries. The claims are absolutely inconsistent.

Nor do we limit our inconsistencies relative to citizenship merely to the place of birth. The United States Constitution gives Congress full control of establishing laws for naturalization, and so of providing that aliens may become citizens of this country.

Not many years ago we threatened vengeance on Turkey because Turkey demanded the military service of naturalized American citizens who had left Turkey, become naturalized here, and then returned to the place of their birth. And yet the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court solemnly decided in 1813 that allegiance to the government of the country of one's birth cannot be discharged by naturalization in a foreign country, and that his duties to his native country remain unchanged and unencumbered by such naturalization. (*Ainslee v. Martin*, 9 MASS. 454.) Because a Russian Consul in New York enunciated the same doctrine, a howl of outrage was raised in Congress, and echoed throughout the newspaper press of our country. "O consistency, thou art indeed a jewel!",—but rarely found among the American people!

Fortunately the most serious of the inconsistencies with reference to citizenship, which might otherwise easily lead to war, have been largely regulated by treaties with different countries, which treaties provide with considerable detail for the rights of citizens of the one

country temporarily in another country, and to a certain extent provide for a means of determining who are citizens, within the meaning of the treaties.

Let us take up another matter. According to the accepted maxims of International Law:—if indeed there be such a thing as International Law—which by many authorities is considered doubtful—every sovereign nation has the power as inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation, to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its domains, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe.

I may be pardoned if I express some doubt as to the existence of International Law when I tell you that a couple of years ago I endeavored to secure for the Boston University Law School certain lectures on International Law, by David Jayne Hill, one of the most accomplished and learned of the American diplomats, who has represented this country in various foreign courts. His reply to me was: "There is no international law. No nation has ever observed what has heretofore been called International Law, except when it suited its convenience so to do."

Nevertheless, practically all nations have universally agreed or assented to the doctrine that each nation could determine for itself who should be admitted within its domain; and this upon the same principle which determines your right to admit as a visitor, as a servant, or as a resident into your house, only those persons whom you choose. It is purely a matter of individual taste for you to determine for yourself and without interference from your neighbor, whether you will admit a bald-headed gentleman into your home.

It is under this principle that, notwithstanding our treaties of friendship with China and Japan, we exercise an extensive, indeed an almost universal right, of excluding the Mongolian. It is under the same principle, notwithstanding our friendly treaties with practically all other nations such as Great Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, etc., we have made it unlawful to assist the importation of any alien laborers under any contract to perform labor or service. Our law makes certain exceptions, e. g., domestic servants; but the exceptions are not important for our discussion, although the exceptions to a certain extent furnish some amusement. For example, under this law there was a prosecution for bringing in a minister of the gospel, and, in the lower court, the Church of the Holy Trinity was convicted of crime for importing a rector. The Supreme Court of the United States

reversed the decision and made a clear distinction between laboring in the Vineyard of the Lord, and laboring on a dairy farm.

Notice, therefore, that we discriminate against certain citizens of foreign countries, viz: those who have a yellow-colored skin, and those who have contracted to labor in this country. We forbid their entrance and we provide that if they get in they may be deported, and this without any right of trial by jury. In other words, they have not the right of citizens, nor of guests;—they are not to be admitted.

But when some other country attempts to exclude one of our citizens, our conduct exhibits all of the lack of liberality without any of the good nature which was indicated by the conversation between Father Kelly, a good priest, and Rabbi Levy, with whom Father Kelly was on the best of terms. They were seated at dinner where some delicious roast ham was served. Presently Father Kelly turned to the Rabbi and facetiously said: "Rabbi, when are you going to become liberal enough to eat ham?"; and the Rabbi, with equal good-nature and wit, answered: "At your wedding, Father Kelly."

I have already told you that much of the inconsistency and difficulty with reference to the rights of citizens in foreign countries was regulated by treaties. A few years ago one of these treaties, viz: one with Russia, was abrogated by the United States. That treaty provided, among other things, that the inhabitants of the respective countries shall be at liberty to reside in all parts of the countries in order to attend to their affairs, "and they shall enjoy to that effect the same security and protection as natives of the country wherein they reside, on condition of their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing."

Russia, before allowing any foreigner to enter its domain, required that his passport should be viséd by a Russian Consul. This visé will not be granted without a statement of the religion of the applicant. I hold no brief for Russia, and I quite agree with the majority of my fellow citizens that it is distasteful and un-American that any man should be asked his religious beliefs as a pre-requisite to his gaining or holding or asserting his rights as a citizen. But what does our country do? With an impulsiveness and inconsistency which has too frequently characterized our diplomacy, a resolution was introduced in Congress stating that Russia had violated her treaty with us, and demanding its abrogation. This resolution passed Congress with only one dissenting vote—that of our present Governor. At present, therefore, and for years, we have had no treaty with Russia securing the rights of citizens,

and any exchange of courtesy by the one nation to the citizens of the other, is merely a matter of comity and friendship. Russia is the only great foreign nation with which we have no such treaty, excepting of course the nation with which we are at war. Prior to our break with Germany, Russia was the one nation with which we were, in the diplomatic sense, most nearly at war.

Russia treated the American Jew exactly the same as she treated the English, the Austrian and the German Jew, and better than she treated her own Russian Jews. There was no discrimination against Americans. There was, however, discrimination against Jews.

You will observe that not only did we abrogate our treaty with Russia, leaving the Jews and all our other citizens without the protection theretofore existing, but we insultingly stated that Russia had violated her treaty with us; in other words, we branded Russia as a contract breaker. You should, however, also have in mind that from the words of the treaty or contract made in 1832, Russia agreed only that our citizens should enjoy the same security and protection as native Russians, and only on condition of their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing. It is at least disputable whether Russia really broke the treaty; that would be a fair matter for judicial decision. If you have made a contract with another individual and he does something which you think he has no right to do under the contract, is it dignified, courteous or just for you to proclaim him a contract breaker? You have a right to bring the question before the proper tribunal for decision as to whether you or he is right. Contemplate, however, our inconsistency as to just such matters with reference to Mongolians. We say to China, Japan, and even to Russia: "These yellow-skinned citizens of yours cannot enter." If we are asked why, as I have already stated, it is sufficient answer to them to say: "Because we choose to keep them out; we do not like yellow skins; we don't like people who contract to labor." And when Japan protests, we, especially in California, shriek that this is an outrageous interference with our labor law, and with our laborers.

Please don't misunderstand me. Personally I think Russia's exclusion of the Jews was unreasonable and should have been overcome. It has, however, *not* been overcome, and our method of trying to overcome it seems to me to be erroneous, undiplomatic and unjust.

Consider another matter. Only a few months ago American citizens were requested to keep out of Mexico, and those who were already there were requested to leave during Mexico's so-called war. Some of

us may differ as to whether this was wise. I am not here to discuss that question, though personally I think it was wise. I would rather have our nation too slow in avenging even a death, than to have it unnecessarily plunge into a cataclysm which engulfs many lives. We declined to protect the lives or the vested property rights and homes of our citizens who, acting under our treaty with Mexico, had established themselves and their business in that country; and we notified them to go out and keep out, both because we deemed that notice necessary for their own safety, and also for the peace and safety of our nation while Mexico was at war.

Then came the war in Europe; and we refused to request Americans not to travel on belligerent English ships. Many of our citizens wanted us to go to war against Germany because our citizens were molested and killed while on belligerent ships, even though those ships were engaged in carrying munitions of war to kill Germans. Hundreds of Americans were killed in Mexico; thousands were driven from their Mexican homes and businesses, compared with a few score who were killed or inconvenienced by the German sinking of British steamers. Our Government, this time consistently, declined to be rushed into war for such cause, although it seems to most of us that the action of both Mexico and Germany was a violation of our rights.

Consider another inconsistency. We made a national protest to Turkey because their mobs killed Armenian citizens of Turkey. In this country negroes are killed singly and *en bloc*; sometimes they are burned alive. Imagine the state of our feelings if some European country should protest to us because of our "barbarous massacres!"

We have now embarked upon another inconsistency. For many years the Monroe Doctrine, so-called, has been formally asserted as a principle necessary to our national safety. It is difficult to define, and it has varied somewhat according to diplomatic expediency. Practically, however, it has amounted to the assertion that no non-American country should be permitted to gain additional territory or to interfere with governmental rights in either North or South America. To be consistent we should of course assent that we will not interfere with the Governmental rights of other countries across the seas.

Still! We have seized the Philippines, and established a system of government there; and now we are engaged in a great war; our soldiers are in Europe, and it has been practically asserted by our President, that the Government of our enemy must be changed. That is, the President has stated that we could not make peace with the Gov-

ernment of Germany without "further assurances" that the present Government of Germany can give.

Germany has deeply outraged and wronged us. The question of when our nation ought to go to war because our rights have been violated and our people outraged, is not always easily answered to the satisfaction of everyone. The question to be determined before going to war is: Have the wrongs reached a stage where they are unendurable? If they have reached that stage, then under present, somewhat uncivilized world conditions, there seems to be no remedy but war. But every national wrong does not demand war. We have already referred to the Mexican wrongs; to the German sinking of Americans on English ships, neither of which brought war. There have been other such examples.

Thus England violated our rights before we joined in the war. She asserted domination over the sea. On November 2, 1914, she gave orders closing the North Sea, and notified us to travel there on certain designated routes only, although it has heretofore been regarded as settled International Law (if there be any International Law), that all of the open sea more than three marine miles from shore was a free highway over which all neutrals should have an unhindered right of travel. Two of our vessels, the SS. CARIB and the SS. EVELYN, wandered from the English appointed paths and were sunk, with the loss of the lives of American citizens. We protested rather mildly, and, so far as I know, no sane person wanted war, though our property was destroyed and our citizens killed. The mildness of our protest for these grievous wrongs encouraged Germany to believe that she might herself apply to the greater area of the whole Atlantic Ocean, the illegal restrictions which Great Britain applied to the North Sea, and Germany arrogantly notified us just where and how frequently we would be permitted to travel in the Atlantic, and then sunk our ships which did not comply with her orders.

The action of England above outlined was a violation of our rights. The action of Germany was far more extensive; a far greater violation of and injury to our rights; it was far more arrogant in its manner; it was infinitely more malignant in its execution. There is a marked difference between one of our ships running on a mine which has been planted, even though no one had a right to plant it there, and the malicious lying in wait for one of our ships and then intentionally torpedoing that ship and killing the passengers and crew. We would have had a *right* to go to war with England because of what she did. We sensibly did not

do so. We certainly were justified in going to war with Germany for the greater wrongs which she committed. The proper constitutional authorities have decided that these wrongs passed all endurance and that war was demanded. We are now engaged in that war, and it is our duty, and ultimately it will be to our advantage, to sacrifice everything necessary to carry out that war manfully and successfully. Prior to our declaration of a state of war, we of course had a right to discuss the question of whether our participation therein was necessary, wise or expedient. At that time honest and loyal patriots might properly differ; but after the proper constitutional authorities decided that question, it was no longer open for discussion. He who cannot, or will not, cheerfully accept and loyally support a final decision properly made by any Constitutional authority, is not fit to be a citizen of a republic or a democracy. He ought to have no right to participate in government. Anyone who now opposes or obstructs the war, whether it be by inducing men not to enlist, or by opposing the draft, or by inciting strikes which embarrass production or distribution of ammunition and other supplies is disloyal; is in effect a traitor.

The attempt by some persons to discuss the constitutionality of drafting soldiers to fight in foreign lands strikes me as inconsistent and almost, if not entirely, disloyal. Think of it! The Constitution says the Congress shall have power to declare war. It is insufficient and poor warfare, it is ridiculous warfare, which insists that the fighting shall be only on our own property; that *our* property should be destroyed, but the enemy's property uninjured. War is hateful, and when possible should be avoided; but, when once entered, should be so conducted as to inflict a maximum of damage to the enemy with a minimum of damage to ourselves. If anyone's neck must have boils, I prefer that it should be my enemy's neck. His is the least objectionable neck. If I must fight, I prefer to attack my enemy when he is weakest, and when I have others to help me; not to wait until he catches me out alone on a night when he is in full strength.

Chief Justice Taney, writing the opinion for the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Fleming v. Page*, 9 How 603, 615, said: as commander-in-chief, "He (the President) may invade the hostile country and subject it to the sovereignty and authority of the United States."

Furthermore, whatever one may have thought before we entered the war, if, under present circumstances, Germany should win, she would be the ruler of the world;—which as I stated early in my remarks,

would be a calamity too great to be endured. We are confronted by a real peril, which must be met with the whole-hearted allegiance of every citizen. Every one of us must earnestly, yea—enthusiastically, support our Army and Navy.

But supporting the Army and Navy does not mean that we must adopt illogical views as to political aims, even if they are advocated by our President. I see no occasion for action so inconsistent with our Monroe Doctrine, as for us to attempt to dictate what form of government any peoples of Europe should adopt. That is none of our business. The Monroe Doctrine more nearly affects our stability and prosperity than does the form of government of any European nation. We have a big enough job to see that our own people are properly governed, our citizens protected and the governments of other American countries not interfered with.

Let us, therefore, now prepare for peace terms which will secure an abiding peace; let us see that it is a peace to the honest advantage of the United States and the whole world, and not merely a peace to the advantage of a dominating ally. Let it be a peace of right and not of might; of justice, not merely of power. If possible, let us enforce an agreement for substantial disarmament, not only on the land as applied to Germany and all other countries, but on sea as applied to England and all other countries. Let us have neither German nor English domination on either land or sea. Let us provide for a peace which will guarantee that no nation will again dictate to us or to others, or try to dominate over us in the exercise of our rights. Let us secure the actual observance of and obedience to the doctrine which, even while they violate it, both England and Germany profess to desire, viz: the freedom of the seas; especially the right of all neutrals to travel the world's watery highway without hindrance or molestation.

But, to my mind, the task is incomplete, the future is not secure, unless we also obtain a world tribunal of justice to decide international disputes, to lay down and then to enforce real International Law, with enough united force to compel compliance with its decrees and with the necessary power to enforce the disarmament agreement. To prevent Germany from winning is merely temporarily to save ourselves, until some other powerful nation disregards International Law and tramples on our rights. If we want to snatch a real benefit from the world disaster, we must secure an agreement for substantial disarmament *and* an international court to decide *all* disputes. This is really worth fighting for.

Let us go on with the war. I quote Lincoln, with a change of one word: With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up this *world's* wounds; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

This is not a mere dream. It can be done. We must first beat Germany into a permanent realization that its Army cannot win; that Germany cannot dominate the world. But at the peace discussion—for ultimately that must come—we must try to have Great Britain appreciate that this was the *world's* victory, for justice and against wrong; not England's for commercial aggrandizement or colonial conquest. The nations will be nearly bankrupt. Even now there are parties in England which mean to repudiate the State and Municipal debts of that country. These parties are so powerful that the London Times says they "have the Government by the throat." I dislike to believe, I hardly can believe, that they will succeed. Honest persons will be willing to subordinate almost everything else to making provision for the payment of national debts;—the maintenance of national honor. The best way to rehabilitate the weak financial condition will be to stop spending money for military and naval purposes. Arguments in favor of disarmament were popular before this war, and nearly every one favored disarmament. *Now* nearly everyone says we must have Universal Military Service. That is, we must have all our young men who ought to be producers, or preparing to become producers, go into military training and be mere consumers preparing for destruction. Those ante bellum arguments for disarmament have now lost their popularity; they have not lost their potency. The trouble is that the pendulum swung too far towards disarmament; now it has swung too far the other way. So long as other nations are perpetually prepared for war, we also must be prepared. The man who, here in Massachusetts, goes around with a pistol in his pocket is foolish, is reckless, and invites trouble. The man who in former days, in the mining regions of the West, did not carry a pistol was foolish and reckless and invited disaster. If all persons and governments would unite in being prepared for peace and the orderly enforcement of the decrees of the Court, it would be infinitely better for all. And yet, even here in Massachusetts, we need a few armed policemen. It ought to be possible to agree that each nation shall be allowed to have a certain limited maximum number of soldiers and trained men, and limited ships of war; that each nation *must* have a minimum of soldiers or ships; to agree to provide for a World Court to

determine whether any nation violates this agreement or otherwise wrongs any other nation; to provide that no nation shall make any alliance with any other without the public approval of this World Court; and that all of the soldiers and ships of all nations shall be used to police the world and enforce the decrees of the World Court.

Had there been such a World Court in the summer of 1914, when Austria made its unreasonable demands on Serbia, and if such Court had notified Austria that it would hear and determine the punishment to be given Serbia for its improper conduct towards Austria, and that all the force of France, Russia, Great Britain, Japan, the United States, Norway, Sweden, Holland and South America, would put down any display of force or fighting, there now would be no war. Austria would not have dared to insist upon its demand. Neither Austria nor Germany appreciated the extent of the military power which they have since exhibited.

My friends, our country has sometimes been illogical and inconsistent. These varying and inconsistent views and actions are not good for us; they are not good for the world; they are not healthy. We ought, even in international affairs, approximate the Golden Rule of doing unto others as we would have others do unto us. And we ought to be glad to welcome a World Court which could enforce that rule as well against us as against all others. It is the duty of every one of us to try to learn the real truth, and then to act in behalf of our country, calmly, with reason and with logic. Mobs are governed by emotion;—nations ought to be governed by reason. The deception which most injures us is self-deception. Those who cannot see their own wrongs are the worst of sinners, for they do not see where they should improve. On the other hand, I would not have you think that I do not appreciate, that I would not have you appreciate, the great and, everything considered, good country in which we live. On the whole our nation has given a creditable and a glorious example of self-government. Like everything human, it has made some mistakes, but it has accomplished much for liberty, for freedom, for constitutional self-restraint, and for human progress.

Therefore, in closing, I offer you a toast—a combination of two old toasts, neither of which, alone, has ever satisfied me: "My country, may she always be right; when not right, may she be set right; but finally, right or wrong, my country!"

THE
DUNBAR KERR
COMPANY
MALDEN, MASS.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 018 465 789 2